REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, and 6-8 are pending.

Claims 1 and 4 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4 and 6-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yutaka (JP 08-050290) in view of Benzing et al. (US Patent 6,547,910). This rejection is traversed.

In the Amendment filed September 27, 2005, claim 1 had been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 2 of "tilting a mounting surface for the polarizer." In addressing this amendment, the Final Office Action stated that Benzing discloses that, "roller 19 tilts to accommodate the shape and contours of support 6."

Claim 4 had been amended to incorporate the limitation of claim 5 of a "holder for holding an end portion of the polarizer." The same statement that "roller 19 tilts to accommodate the shape and contour of support 6," apparently applies to this limitation in claim 4, as well.

According to the present specification, the sticking part of the polarizer B tilts so that a small gap is created between the liquid crystal panel A and the sticking part of the polarizer B (specification at pages 23-24). Also according to the present specification, the vacuum holder 15 holds the rear end portion of the polarizer and moves so as to follow the movement of the polarizer B.

Benzing teaches a roll 19 used for pressing and adhesively bonding stone layer 2 with plastic fixing film 1 onto supporting element 6. In particular, Benzing teaches a step of tilting roll

Docket No.: 4794-0101P

19 about its axis 21 to achieve the effect that stone layer 2 is adapted to and pressed onto the

entire surface contour of supporting element 6 by repeated rolling over.

Regarding claim 1, applicants submit that Benzing's roll 19 could not constitute a

mounting surface of the polarizing plate 40 of Yutaka. Benzing does not disclose, for example,

tilting the support member 6. Regarding claim 4, Benzing's layer 2 is not disclosed, for example,

as moving. Benzing does not disclose roll 19 as, for example, holding an end portion of layer 2

and following movement of the layer 2.

In order to clarify this distinction, claims 1 and 4 have been amended. In particular, claim

1 has been amended to clarify that the claimed mounting surface is a surface of the polarizer,

which is tilted to form a gap between the polarizer and the substrate (e.g., gap between A and B

shown in Figs. 15 and 16). Also, clarification has been made to in the relation between the gap

and the sticking operation, in particular, that sticking occurs at a position after the gap.

Clarification has been made to claim 4 to indicate which end of the polarizer is held.

At least because of these amendments, Applicants request that the rejection be

reconsidered and withdrawn based on the claims as amended.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present

application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs (Reg. No.

48,222) at the telephone number of (703) 205 8000, to conduct an interview in an effort to

6

expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

CG/RWD/kpc

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants respectfully petition for a one (1) month extension of time for filing a response in connection with the present application and the required fee of \$120.00 is being filed concurrently herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

In view of the above amendment, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: April 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Gorenstein

Registration No.: 29,271

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants